

ŚRI

TATTVA SANDARBHA

of
ŚRILA JĪVA GOSVĀMĪ
The First Book of the
ŚRĪ-ŚAT-SANDARBHA

Appendix II
Analysis of the dispute over the length of
the Bhagavatam (332 or 335 chapters)

Translation & Commentary

Satya Nārāyana Dāsa
Kundalī Dāsa

APPENDIX Two

**ANALYSIS OF THE DISPUTE OVER THE
LENGTH OF THE BHĀGAVATAM
(332 OR 335 CHAPTERS)**

Some scholars disagree about the number of chapters in *Śrīmad-Bhāgavatam*. They consider chapters Twelve, Thirteen, and Fourteen of the Tenth Canto interpolated. These chapters describe the killing of Aghāsura, the stealing of the calves and cowherd boys by Lord Brahmā, and Brahmā's prayers to Lord Kṛṣṇa. The controversy is an old one and the dissenting scholars are a diverse group—some are *Bhāgavatam* commentators from the *Puṣṭi-mārga-sampradāya* of Vallabhācārya, some are from the Madhvā-sampradāya, and others are from the *Śrī-sampradāya* of Rāmānujācārya. Of these, only the ācāryas of the Vallabha-sampradāya have gone to great lengths to substantiate that these three chapters are interpolated. Others have only mentioned in passing that they consider these chapters interpolated or have indirectly disapproved of them by not commenting on them.

In contrast, Gaudiya ācāryas, along with ācāryas of the Nimbārka and Śaṅkara *saṃpradāyas*, and some other well-known commentators on *Śrīmad-Bhāgavatam*, consider the three chapters in question authentic. In the Gaudiya line Śrīla Sanātana Gosvāmī's *Brhad-vaiṣṇava Toṣanī*, Śrīla Jīva Gosvāmī's *Vaiṣṇava Toṣanī*, and Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa's *Siddhānta Darpana*, briefly state that the Gaudiya-sampradāya regards the three chapters as authentic.

In the 19th century an ācārya in the Vallabha-sampradāya, Giridhara Lāl Gosvāmī, wrote a lengthy essay entitled *Adhyāya-traya-prakṣiptatva-samarthanam* (Evidence That the Three Chapters Are Interpolated). Not only did the author launch a systematic attempt to refute Śrīla Jīva Gosvāmī, but he depicted him as an ācārya-drohi—one who rebels against previous ācāryas. Lāl further claimed that Śrī Jīva was not even a devotee, what to speak of a recipient of Lord

Kṛṣṇa's mercy. He wrote, "Jīva Gosvāmī is unable to understand the learned opinion of Śrī Vallabhācārya."

There is a Sanskrit saying, *ācārya kṛtvā na nivartante*, "Ācāryas do not return to support their writings." Hence it is the duty of the followers to defend the valuable conclusions left by them. The three chapters in question are virtually the commentary on Vyāsadeva's statement, *kṛṣṇa's tu bhagavān svayam*—Kṛṣṇa is the original Supreme Person. If they are rejected, Śrīla Vyāsadeva's very purpose for writing the book would not be fulfilled. Lāl's critique virtually includes all points his predecessor ācāryas gave in their attempt to establish that the *Bhāgavatam* has only 332 chapters. Thus, if his essay is refuted, all such lesser ones will automatically collapse as per the logic called *pradhāna-malla-barhana nyāya*—if the champion wrestler is defeated, then all other contenders are defeated. Here I shall give the gist of his views, then respond with the evidence given by the Gaudiya ācāryas.

My purpose is not to criticize those who do not accept these three chapters as part of the *Śrīmad-Bhāgavatam*; rather it is to uphold the conclusive opinion of Jīva Gosvāmī. This I will do with logic, scriptural references, history, and the testimony of saintly persons. *Na hi nindā nindayitum pravartate api tu vidheyam stotum*, "The purpose of a critique is not to find fault in others; it is to establish the proper conclusion about the subject." The truth must be revealed to enlighten sincere students. *Yena iṣṭam tena gamyatām*, "Ultimately everyone is free to follow their desired path."

In one work which explains the gist of *Śrīmad-Bhāgavatam*, Śrī Vallabhācārya explains that three types of language are used therein: (1) *Samādhi bhāṣā*—the language of trance; (2) *Laukikī bhāṣā*—the language used in material descriptions; (3) *Anyabhāṣā*—language other than the above two. The last two support the first. (*Śrīmad-Bhāgavatārtha-prakaraṇam* 1.11,12):

*esā samādhi-bhāṣā hi vyāsasyāmitatejasah
laukikī cānyabhāṣā ca samādheḥ poṣike tu te*

This verse indicates that in *Śrīmad-Bhāgavatam* repetitions and apparent contradictions will be found owing to the

fact that it is not all written in the *Laukikī bhāṣā*, or the language of the common man. Therefore, in explaining this verse, Vallabhācārya says that in *Śrīmad-Bhāgavatam* it appears there is glorification of knowledge, contradiction between earlier and later parts, and defects of repetition, but in reality such is not the case. He says that this can be resolved by knowing that there are three types of languages.

Here the founder of *Puṣṭi-mārga* has recognized two types of apparent problems: (1) contradictory parts of a story, (2) repetition of some statements. Vallabhācārya and other commentators recognize these apparent problems in *Śrīmad-Bhāgavatam* and have tried to resolve them. In light of this, it is inconsistent that some commentators insist on labeling Chapters Twelve, Thirteen, and Fourteen as spurious by citing the same defects other commentators have resolved in other sections of the *Śrīmad-Bhāgavatam*. In the case of Śrīla Jīva Gosvāmī, he has resolved these contradictions in a simple manner, and thus he sees no reason for rejecting them. Lāl Gosvāmī sees this as an affront, however, and has made many harsh comments about Śrīla Jīva Gosvāmī.

The internal disharmony or contradiction in the *Śrīmad-Bhāgavatam* can be resolved if it is demonstrated that these chapters have been accepted by previous ācāryas. Then there is no reason for debate. Giridhara Lāl has also accepted this principle. Commenting on verses 10.11.10-20 he writes: "Some commentators have explained these eleven verses and some have not, but because they are found in the books and they are not against the topic under narration, we shall explain them." Then he comments on these eleven verses although they have been left out by even Vallabhācārya.

On the other hand, Śrīla Jīva Gosvāmī has reconciled the apparent inconsistencies of Chapters Twelve, Thirteen and Fourteen. Therefore he says there is no reason to consider these chapters spurious. If a commentator is unable to resolve the contradiction, it is because of his deficiency in scholarship and not receiving the grace of the Lord. Amazingly, Lal tries to blame those who have solved the problem. Indeed it is

easier to label the three chapters spurious rather than delve into them and see how wonderfully they fit into *Śrīmad-Bhāgavatam*. It is said, *dhanañjaye hātakasām parikṣā* *vidyāvatām bhāgavate parikṣā*, "One's scholarship is tested in *Śrīmad-Bhāgavatam* just as gold is tested in fire."

To explain Lal's objections I begin with an extract from Śrīla Jīva Gosvāmī's *Vaiṣṇava Toṣanī*. In this way readers can have a better sense of Lal's objections. In commenting on *Bhāgavatam* 10.12.1 Jīva Gosvāmī writes:

We see no reason why some people do not accept the three chapters, i.e. Twelve, Thirteen, and Fourteen; and the six verses beginning with 10.6.35, and verse 10.6.44 which explain the liberation of Pūtanā. These pastimes are known to people all over the land by hearing from their superiors. Numerous commentators of old as well as modern ones have explained these chapters. Some of these commentaries are *Vāsanā-bhāṣya*, *Sambandhokti*, *Vidvat-kāmadhenu*, *Śuka-manoharā*, and *Paramahamsa Priyā*. If someone says that these are not authentic, being unacceptable to their *saṃpradāya*, then, by the same logic, why not consider them authentic since they are accepted by other *saṃpradāyas*?

One cannot say that in the *Śrīmad-Bhāgavatam* Lord Kṛṣṇa is not mentioned as Aghabhid, the killer of Aghāsura, like Murabhid, the killer of Mura demon. In 3.15.23 of the *Bhāgavatam* He is called Aghabhit, the destroyer of the Agha demon or dispeller of sins, *yan na vṛajanty aghabhido racanānuvādāc chṛṇvanti ye'nya-viṣayāḥ kukathā matighnīḥ*. One cannot say that these pastimes described in the chapters in question are not mentioned in the *Bhāgavatam* list of the Lord's pastimes, because Śridhara Svāmī has mentioned them in his lists. Thus when Śridhara Svāmī says *dvātrimśat triśatam ca yasya vilasat sākhā*, "It has 335 chapters," he does not mention that three chapters are not included, because his commentary is available with the chapter numbers mentioned and the same verses in them. Nor should one think that some other three chapters are to be accepted as interpolated. (Supporters of the interpolation theory have translated the word *dvātrimśat triśatam* as 332, which it appears to be at a cursory look.) This phrase

has a *dvandva-samāsa* of the words *dvātrīṁśat* (32), *traya* (3), and *śatāni* (hundreds)—*dvātrīṁśat ca trayaś ca śatāni ca* and the word *śatāni* (hundreds) means three hundred because in Sanskrit the plural means three or more. Here the number three is indicated by the *kapiñjala-ālabhana nyāya*,¹ otherwise the plural can mean any number over two and will remain ambiguous. If it is not accepted as a *dvandva-samāsa* the word should become *triśatī* according to the grammatical rules and not *triśatam*.

These chapters should not be rejected because they go against the principle that demons killed by Kṛṣṇa attain liberation. (Aghāsura's liberation is described in the Twelfth Chapter after he was killed by Lord Kṛṣṇa. The Madhvites do not accept that demons Kṛṣṇa kills attain liberation. This is one of their reasons for rejecting these three chapters. They do not reject them on the claim that they were interpolated.) That the demons killed by Kṛṣṇa attain liberation is described in *Śrīmad-Bhāgavatam*.

Bhagavad-gītā 16.20 states:

*āsurīṁ yonim āpannā mūḍhā janmani janmani
mām aprāpyaiva kaunteya tato yānty adhamāṁ gatim*

“Birth after birth, attaining the species of demoniac life, O son of Kuntī, such deluded persons, not attaining Me, sink down to the most abominable type of existence.”

This and other such verses state that demons go to the lower species not having attained Kṛṣṇa. If they had attained Kṛṣṇa, like the demons He killed, they would not go to the lower species. Thus it is said in *Śrīmad-Bhāgavatam* (2.7.34,35):

*ye ca pralamba-khara-dardura-keśy-ariṣṭa-
mallebha-karīṣa-yavanāḥ kapi-paundrakādyāḥ
anye ca śālva-kuja-balvala-dantavakra-
saptokṣa-śambara-vidūratha-rukmi-mukhyāḥ*

*ye vā mṛdhe samiti-śālinī ātta-cāpāḥ
kāmboja-matsya-kuru-srījaya-kaikayādyāḥ
yāsyanty adarśanam alām bala-pārtha-bhīma-
vyājāhvayena harīṇā nilayam tadiyam*

¹ *Vasante kapiñjalān ālabhet*. According to this Vedic injunction, one should perform sacrifice in the spring season with *kapiñjala* birds. The number is not indicated, but because it is in the plural case, three is accepted by the *Pūrva mīmāṁsakas*. Otherwise the statement remains unclear.

"All demonic persons like Pralamba, Dhenuka, Baka, Keśī, Ariṣṭa, Cānura, Muṣṭika, Kuvalayapīda, Karīsa, Kāla-Yavana, Narakāsura and Paṇḍraka, great marshals like Śālva, Dvivida, Balvala, Dantavaktra, the seven bulls, Śambara, Vidūratha, and Rukmi, as also great warriors from Kāmboja, Matsya, Kuru, Śrījaya and Kekaya, and other great heroes who would all fight vigorously carrying bows, either with Lord Hari directly or with Him under His names of Baladeva, Arjuna, Bhīma, etc. will attain liberation being killed by the Lord."

The pastimes in the three chapters are also described in the *Padma* and *Brahmāṇḍa Purāṇa*, therefore they cannot be rejected as if they are not mentioned in other scriptures. Also, the sites where these pastimes occurred are still popularly known in Vṛndāvana. We have no reason to reject the liberation of Aghāsura thinking that it is not possible for a demon to achieve a destination similar to the one attained by a devotee. Besides, pure devotees do not covet such liberation, as is known from hundreds of verses. For example, *Bhāg. 3.15.48*:

nātyantikam vigaṇayanty api te prasādāṁ
kintv anyad arpita-bhayāṁ bhrūva unnayais te
ye 'ṅga tvad-aṅghri-śarana bhavataḥ kathāyāḥ
kīrtanya-tīrtha-yaśasāḥ kuśalā rasa-jñāḥ

"Persons who are very expert and have knowledge of pure devotional service engage in hearing narrations of the auspicious activities and pastimes of the Lord, which are worth chanting and hearing. Such persons do not care even for Your mercy in the form of liberation, to say nothing of other less important benedictions like the happiness of the heavenly kingdom, which are destroyed just by a flick of your eyebrow."

The six verses explaining that Pūtanā attained the position of mother should not be rejected by those who are aware of the glory of such a post, thinking that such a destination is not possible for her. It should be known that she attained such a place due to the *sad-veśa*, or the saintly dress of a *gopī*, as is clear from *Bhāg. 10.14.35*:

eṣāṁ ghoṣa-nivāśināṁ uta bhavān kiṁ deva rāteti naś
ceto viśva-phalāt phalaṁ tvad-aparāṁ kutrāpy ayan muhyati

*sad-veśād iva pūtanāpi sa-kulā tvām eva devāpitā
yad-dhāmārtha-suhṛt-priyātma-tanaya-prānāśayās tvat-krte*

"My mind becomes bewildered when I think what reward other than You could be found anywhere. You are the embodiment of all benedictions. Even Pūtanā and her family members, in exchange for her disguising herself as a *gopī* (female devotee), have attained you. So what will You give to these devotees of Vṛndāvana, whose homes, wealth, friends, dear relations, bodies, children and very lives and hearts are all dedicated to You?"

Here the real cause of Pūtanā's liberation was her dressing as a *gopī*, so only the position of *gopī* is being glorified. Vijayadhava Tīrtha's attempt to reconcile the verses describing Pūtanā's liberation with his understanding is unsatisfactory.

One should not be bewildered just by reading the word *gopī*, referring to the women whose breasts Lord Kṛṣṇa suckled during the one year period of the *Brahma-vimohana-līlā*, and conclude that He could not have engaged in the *rāsa* dance with the same *gopīs*. The *gopīs* whose breasts He suckled were of the same age as mother Yaśodā, while those with whom He danced were His age. Thus there is no contradiction. In these chapters the glories of devotion, the devotees, and the Lord have been explained in an extraordinary manner, but these can be realized only by the special mercy of the Lord, hence these are very secret pastimes, as said by Śrī Śuka (*Bhāg. 10.13.3*):

*śrnuśvāvahito rājann api guhyam vadāmi te
brūyuh snigdhasya śiṣyasya guravo guhyam api uta*

O king, kindly hear me with great attention. Although the activities of the Lord are confidential, I shall speak about them to you, for spiritual masters explain to a submissive disciple even subject matters that are very confidential and difficult to understand.

This is enough of an explanation.

In *Bṛhad Vaiśnava Toṣāṇī*, Śrīla Sanātana Gosvāmī points out that the Tattva-vādī Vaiśnavas, who consider liberation

the supreme goal of life, are intolerant of these three chapters and the seven verses concerning Pūtanā's destination, for they describe demons attaining liberation and Lord Kṛṣṇa's sucking the breasts of the elderly *gopīs*.

Sanātana Gosvāmī responds to the objection that Lord Kṛṣṇa cannot perform *Rāsa-līlā* with the same *gopīs* whose breasts He suckled when He expanded Himself into cow-herd boys during the *Brahma-vimohana līlā*. Those *gopīs* are on the same level as mother Yaśodā and are not the same beloved young girlfriends with whom Kṛṣṇa engaged in conjugal pastimes.

As Jīva and Sanātana Gosvāmīs make no mention of Vallabhācārya in their explanations, it is clear they were not trying to refute him. Sanātana Gosvami does, however, mention the followers of Madhvācārya known as Tattva-vādīs. Considering this, the *Puṣṭi-mārga ācāryas* should not be offended by Jīva Gosvāmī's conclusion nor attack him caustically as Giridhara Lāl has done.

In his essay, Giridhara Lāl mentions Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa making it clear that Baladeva predated him. Thus he had the advantage of hearing the previous arguments and counter-arguments. His critique is in Sanskrit and a complete translation would be excessive and impractical, so what follows is the gist of his arguments that the *Bhagavatam* has only three hundred thirty-two chapters. The response follows each point.



A It is clear that these three chapters are interpolated because of two defects: former and latter statements do not match, and repetition—the same verse appears at the end of the Eleventh and Fourteenth Chapters:

evarī vihāraih kaumāraih kaumāram jahatur vraje
nilāyanaiḥ setu-bandhair markatotplavanādibhiḥ

In this way Kṛṣṇa and Balarāma passed their childhood, below age five, in the land of Vrndāvana playing hide-and-seek, building play-bridges, jumping about like

monkeys, and engaging in many other such games with the cowherd boys. (Bhāg. 10.11.59 and 10.14.61)

The first verse of the fifteenth chapter reads:

śrī-śuka uvāca
tataś ca paugānda-vayah-śritau vraje
babhūvatus tau paśu-pāla sammatau
gāś cārayantau sakhibhiḥ samarā padair
vṛndāvanarām pūnyam atīva cakratuḥ

Sukadeva Gosvāmī said: Thereafter when Kṛṣṇa and Balarāma reached the *paugānda* age (six years) while living in Vṛndāvana, the cowherd men gave Them permission to tend the cows. In this way tending the cows in the company of Their friends, the two boys made the land of Vṛndāvana most auspicious by marking it with Their lotus feet.

Thus there is a proper continuity between the last verse of the Eleventh Chapter and the first verse of the Fifteenth, because the earlier verses speak of Kṛṣṇa and Balarāma passing the *kaumāra* age (below five) and the later verses speak of Their entering the *paugānda* age (above five). The interim three chapters describe Their *kaumāra* pastimes and therefore they do not fit after the above quoted final verse of the Eleventh Chapter. Thus the repetition of the same verse at the end of the Fourteenth Chapter shows that Śrī Śukadeva Gosvāmī did not speak these three chapters.

Vallabhācārya says they were added later to excite people by presenting such wonderous pastimes. Śrī Śukadeva Gosvāmī, being a perfected sage cannot forget his earlier statement that Lord Kṛṣṇa gave up the *kaumāra* stage. Nor is it possible that he forgot to speak these three chapters and only after speaking verse 10.11.59 did he suddenly remember to narrate them.

RESPONSE



Verse 10.11.59, *evam vihāraih kaumāraih*, is repeated at the end of Chapter Fourteen because of Śukadeva's ecstasy after telling the wonderful *brahma-vimohana-līlā*. Śrīla

Vyāsadeva has declared the *Śrīmad-Bhāgavatam* is the mature fruit of the tree of Vedic knowledge and it is full of *rasa*. In *Anuccheda 29* of *Tattva-Sandarbha*, Śrīla Jīva Gosvāmī describes how Śukadeva Gosvāmī gave up his attachment to impersonal Brahman after hearing the beautiful pastimes of the Supreme Personality of Godhead, *sau-sukha-nibhrta-cetās tad vyudastānya-bhāvo'py ajita-rucira-līlā krṣṇasārastadīyam* (*Bhāg.* 12.13.68). He tasted the *rasa* of the *Bhāgavatam* by reciting it, and was completely immersed in it as is stated in the *Padma Purāṇa*, *Uttarakhaṇḍa*, *Bhāgavata-mahātmya* (6.101), *rasa-pravāha-saṁsthena* *śrīsukeneritā kathā*: "The *Śrīmad-Bhāgavatam* was recited by Śrī Śuka, who was absorbed in the flow of *rasa*." There are similar statements in the *Bhāgavatam* (10.80.5):

sūta uvāca
visnu-rātena samprsto bhagavān bādarāyanīḥ
vāsudeve bhagavati nimagna-hṛdayo 'bravīt

Thus questioned by King Parīkṣit, the powerful sage Śukadeva, son of Vyāsa, replied, his heart fully absorbed in meditation on the Supreme Personality of Godhead, Vāsudeva.

According to the rules of rhetoric, although repetition of a word or verse is considered a defect in poetry, there are certain exceptions to the rule. The *Sāhitya-darpana* (7.19), a standard work on rhetoric lists eleven exceptions:

vihitasyānuvādyatve viṣade vismaye krudhi
dainye 'tha lāṭānuprāse 'nukampāyām prasādane
arthāntara-saṅkramita-vācye harṣe 'vadhāraṇe

A repetition is not considered a defect in (1) restating the subject; (2) distress; (3) surprise; (4) anger; (5) dejection; (6) *lāṭānuprāsa* (a type of alliteration); (7) showing mercy; (8) pleasing someone; (9) *arthāntara-saṅkramita-vācyādhvani*; a type of implied meaning; (10) happiness; and, (11) and confirming something.

The pastimes described in Chapters Twelve, Thirteen, and Fourteen of the Tenth Canto are very wonderful and certainly aroused deep ecstatic feelings in Śukadeva Gosvāmī causing him to lose external consciousness.

Śrī sūta uvāca
 itthāṁ sma pṛṣṭah sa tu bādarāyanis
 tat smārītānanta-hṛtākhilendriyah
 kṛcchrāt punar labdha-bahir-dṛṣīḥ śanaiḥ
 pratyāha tam bhāgavatottamottama

Sūta Gosvāmī said: O Śaunaka, greatest of saints and devotees, when Māhārāja Parīkṣit inquired from Śukadeva Gosvāmī in this way, Śukadeva, immediately remembering subject matters about Kṛṣṇa within the core of his heart, externally lost contact with his senses. Thereafter, with great difficulty, he revived his external sensory perception and began to speak to Māhārāja Parīkṣit about Kṛṣṇa (Bhāg. 10.12.44).

Commenting on this verse, Śrīla Jīva Gosvāmī writes that the word *punah* (again) indicates that he went into such a state time and again. Lāl comments that the word *kṛcchrāt* (with difficulty) means that they had to play musical instruments to bring Śukadeva back to external consciousness. *Kṛcchrāt kara-tāla-dundubhi-śāṅkhādi-vāadya-yutastotrādi-prayāsāt punah śanair labdhā bahir dṛṣīḥ drṣīḥ yena sah.* Therefore, Sukadeva's repetition of the verse falls within one of the exceptions listed above. Hence there is no defect.

Other examples of verses being repeated in the *Bhāgavatam* are in the Seventh Canto where Nārada Muni instructs Yudhiṣṭhīra Māhārāja and repeats three verses twice (7.10.48-50 are repeated in 7.15.75-77). No commentator ever labeled these verses spurious because they are repeated. Nārada Muni here gives instructions on *varṇāśrama*—not on some wonderful esoteric pastimes of Kṛṣṇa. Still he repeats these verses to give stress. Why then should it be considered spurious if Śrī Śuka repeats one verse, especially when speaking about one of Lord Kṛṣṇa's most wonderful pastimes which bewildered even Lord Brahmā and caused Śukadeva to go into ecstasy?

Moreover, the last verse of the Eleventh Chapter of the Tenth Canto is not found in some editions of the *Bhāgavatam*. The *Anvitārtha Prakāśa* commentary states, *ayam śloko na sārvatrika*, "This verse is not found in all editions." That refutes

Lāl altogether. Still, if these three chapters were interpolated then it is unlikely that the person who did it would make such obvious mistakes that they could be so easily detected. Instead of writing long essays to disprove these three chapters, it would have been more proper for them to reject the fifty-ninth verse of the Eleventh Chapter. But as stated earlier, the real reason the authenticity of these chapters is challenged is that they go against their philosophy.

Again, verses 8.9.28 and 8.10.1 have the same meaning although composed differently. They are only separated by one verse and yet no one considers 8.10.1 interpolated. The verse *arthe hy avidyamāne 'pi* is spoken five times in *Bhāgavatam*—once by Lord Kapila in the Third Canto, twice by Nārada Muni in the Fourth Canto, and twice by Kṛṣṇa in the Eleventh Canto. This repetition is simply to give emphasis.

Repetition also appears when the speaker tells about someone he has strong loving feelings for. In such cases the narrative is not handled in strict chronological order, because the *bhāva*, or the mood of the speaker, is what guides the narration. Thus the Tenth Canto is not meticulously chronological, nor is it necessarily without repetition.

B In the Third Canto, Uddhava does not mention these pastimes found in the disputed chapters during his meeting with Vidura. They are also not mentioned in Sūta's list of the Lord's activities in the Twelfth Canto, nor in Brahmā's list in the Second Canto, nor are they in the list of pastimes imitated by the *gopīs* when Lord Kṛṣṇa disappeared from the *rāsa* dance.

RESPONSE



One should not assume that these lists intend to include all of Kṛṣṇa's pastimes. It does not follow therefore, that since the lists given by Uddhava, Sūta Gosvāmī, and Brahmā do not include the pastimes from the disputed chapters, and that since the *gopīs* did not imitate them, the chapters are interpolated. Sūta Gosvāmī's list, (*Bhāg.12.12.27-40*), is the

most exhaustive, as he gives a summary of the Tenth Canto. Still, it does not include all the pastimes described, such as:

- The Lord's name-giving ceremony
- The Lord's mercy on Kubjā
- The killing of the washerman
- The story of the Syamantaka jewel and the marriage of Jāmbavatī and Satyabhāmā
- The liberation of King Nṛga
- The marriage with Laxmaṇā by shooting the fish
- Kṛṣṇa's dealings with Sudāmā Vipra
- The Lord's trip to Kurukṣetra to meet the cowherd people
- The kidnapping of Subhadrā
- The Lord's trip to Mithilā
- The return of the six sons of Devakī from Yamapuri
- The Lord's visit to Māhā-viṣṇu with Arjuna
- Lord Balarāma's pilgrimage tour
- The killing of Romaharṣaṇa Sūta
- The release of Sāmba from the Kauravas

Those who reject *aghāsura-mokṣa* and *brahma-mohana* on the basis of their not being mentioned in any of the lists of Kṛṣṇa's pastimes must then also consider the above fourteen pastimes spurious for the same reason, otherwise, their argument is inconsistent.

The *gopīs* and Uddhava, being guided by their *bhāva* (emotional state), and not by a sense of accuracy, recalled specific pastimes for their own satisfaction, so to expect a complete list from them is illogical. Except for Sūta Gosvāmī, who was giving a summary of the whole *Bhāgavatam*, no one was attempting to list Kṛṣṇa's pastimes *in toto*. Even so, Even Sūta's list was not all-inclusive, as already shown.

C Śrīnātha Cakravartī writes in his commentary on *Śrīmad-Bhāgavatam*, called *Caitanya-mata-Mañjuṣā*, that the liberation of the Yamala-arjuna trees is not mentioned in Sūta's Twelfth Canto list of the Lord's pastimes. Similarly, the killing of Aghāsura and the *brahma-vimohana* *līlā* are not included in that list, as they are very confidential pastimes. This is a hasty statement born of zeal because Brahmā does mention the *yamala-arjuna-līlā* in verse 2.7.27.

Verse 10.26.7 states that the *gopas* related this pastime, and verse 10.30.23 mentions that the *gopīs* imitated it. So even if not mentioned in the Twelfth Canto, it is mentioned elsewhere, but *aghāsura-līlā* is not mentioned anywhere; therefore, it is not part of *Śrīmad-Bhāgavatam*.

RESPONSE



Śrīnātha Cakravartī was an associate of Lord Caitanya and the initiating guru of Kavi Karnapūra. Regarding the omission of the *Yamal-arjuna-līlā* from Sūta Gosvāmī's list, Lāl says that Śrīnātha Cakravartī made a hasty statement "because of zeal," and cites the Second and Tenth Cantos to refute him. But it is Lāl who is hasty to criticize Śrīnātha who only points out that the pastime is not included in the Twelfth Canto list. He does not claim that the pastime is not mentioned elsewhere.

Furthermore, in some editions of *Śrīmad-Bhāgavatam* *aghāsura* and *brahma-vimohana* *līlās* are mentioned in Sūta Gosvāmī's list. Therein verse 12.12.23 contains the line, *aghāsurbadho dhātrā vatsapālāvā-gūhanam*, which translates as "The killing of Aghāsura and Lord Brahmā's hiding the cowherd boys." Commentaries on this edition include *Krama-Sandarbha*, *Sārārtha Varṣinī*, *Bhakta Manoranjanī*, *Vaiṣṇava Toṣanī*, *Bhāgavat Candrikā* and so on.

D

The bewilderment of Brahmā goes against his own statement in the Second Canto (2.6.34):

*na bhāratī me 'ṅga mṛṣopalakṣyate
na vai kvacin me manaso mṛṣā gatih
na me hr̄ṣikāṇi patanty asat-pathe
yan me hr̄dautkanṭhya-vatā dhṛto hariḥ*

"O Nārada, because I have caught hold of the lotus feet of the Supreme Personality of Godhead, Hari, within my heart, with great zeal, whatever I say has never proven false; nor my mind ever makes false decisions; nor are my senses ever attracted to the illusory objects.

Since Brahmā has realized knowledge about the Lord, it is ludicrous for him to test Lord Kṛṣṇa (as in *brahmā-vimohana līlā*). Indeed Lord Brahmā was already blessed by the Lord as stated below (2.9.37):

*etan matam samātiṣṭha paramena samādhinā
bhavān kalpa-vikalpeṣu na vimuhyati karhicit*

O Brahmā, just remain fixed in this conclusion by fixed concentration of mind and you will not be disturbed in the various types of creations in different *kalpas*.

Also, it cannot be said that this blessing was applicable only in the matter of creation, since that goes against verses 30-32 of the same chapter:

*yāvat sakhā sakhyur iveda te kṛtaḥ
prajā-visarge vibhajāmi bho janam
aviklavas te parikarmanī sthito
mā me samunnaddha-mado 'ja māninah*

O my Lord, You have shaken hands with me just as a friend with a friend. I shall be occupied in Your service creating different types of living entities without any disturbance. I therefore pray that while engaged in this service I may not become overly proud considering myself as unborn.

*śrī-bhagavān uvāca
jñānam parama-guhyam me yad vijñāna-samanvitam
sa-rahasyam tad-aṅgam ca grhāna gaditam mayā*

The Personality of Godhead said: Knowledge about Me, including its realization, is most confidential. Take it from Me, along with its secret meaning and its limbs as I describe it to you.

*yāvān aham yathā-bhāvo yad-rūpa-guṇa-karmakah
tathaiva tattva-vijñānam astu te mad-anugrahāt*

By My mercy let true knowledge about Me, as I am, about My existence, form, qualities, and activities become available to you.

Proof that Lord Brahmā has full understanding about Lord Kṛṣṇa's supreme position is furnished by his own words (*Bhāg. 2.7.27*):

*tokena jīva-haranāṁ yad ulūki-kāyās
 trai-māsikasya ca padā śakaṭo 'pavṛttah
 yad ringatāntara-gatena divi-sprśor vā
 unmūlanāṁ tv itarathārjunayor na bhāvyam*

Kṛṣṇa is the Supreme Lord, otherwise how was it possible for Him to kill a giant demon like Pūtanā when He was just a baby? How could He kick over a cart with His leg when He was only three months old, or uproot a pair of *arjuna* trees, so high that they touched the sky, by merely crawling in between them? No one else but the Lord could do such miraculous activities.

Thus Lord Brahmā lacks the independence to test Lord Kṛṣṇa.

RESPONSE



Lord Brahmā was blessed by Lord Kṛṣṇa not to be bewildered by Māyā. Moreover Brahmā is in complete knowledge of Lord Kṛṣṇa. So how can Brahmā get bewildered? In *Bhāg.* 2.9.29-30 Lord Brahmā asked a boon to remain free from pride while creating. From *Bhāg.* 2.9.37 it is clear that the Lord's blessing protected him from Māyā only in the matter of creating and not while participating in the Lord's pastimes. Those with a thorough understanding of the science of transcendental knowledge know that the Lord has two Māyā potencies, Mahā-māyā and Yoga-māyā. Mahā-māyā causes bewilderment and ignorance and makes the living entity a nondevotee.

Yoga-māyā also makes one forget Kṛṣṇa as the supreme master, replete with all opulences, but this is to facilitate the devotee's participating in the Lord's pastimes. By the influence of Yoga-māyā, the devotee does not understand that Kṛṣṇa is the supreme controller and that "I am His servant," because if devotees always think of Kṛṣṇa as the Supreme Lord there could not be intimate pastimes of friendship and so forth. Only the majestic pastimes of master and servant would exist. An example of Yoga-māyā is seen in *Śrīmad-Bhāgavatam* 10.45.1: *śrī śuka uvāca*

*pitarāv upalabdhārthau viditvā puruṣottamah
 mā bhūd iti nijāṁ māyāṁ tatāna jana mohinīm*

Sukadeva Gosvāmī said: Understanding that His parents have become aware of His opulences, the Supreme Personality of Godhead thought that this should not be allowed to happen. Thus He spread His Yoga-māyā, which bewilders His devotees.

Vallabhācārya divided *māyā* into three—*vimukha-jana-mohinī*, or that which bewilders the nondevotees, *svajana-mohinī*, or that which bewilders the Lord's devotees, and *sva-mohinī*, or that which bewilders the Lord. In Gaudīya Vaiṣṇava terminology the first is designated as Mahā-māyā and the other two as *Yoga-māyā*. The Vaiṣṇava ācāryas have accepted similar divisions of the Lord's *māyā*. Thus it is not an inexplicable novelty that Brahmā was bewildered by *Yoga-māya* so that he could enhance Lord Kṛṣṇa's pastimes in Vraja.

Giridhara Lāl's commentary on *Bhāgavatam* 2.9.36 further reveals his critical nature, on account of which he forgot his own explanation. While commenting on 2.9.28, he writes that Lord Brahmā requested the Supreme Lord to bless him that in the work of creation he should not become bound by pride. In *Bhāg.* 2.9.36, beginning with *etat*, the Lord grants Brahmā's request, telling him to be fixed in transcendental meditation on the philosophy spoken of in the preceding four verses, the *Catuh ślokī Bhāgavatam*. The Lord says that if Brahmā would always think in this way, he would not become possessed by lust, anger, and pride. Lāl concludes "It must be understood therefore that if Brahmā is overcome by lust, anger, and pride on occasion, it is from his forgetting this message."

Lāl says that the Lord's blessing applies only to the act of creation. And interestingly, he even says that sometimes because of forgetting this knowledge, Lord Brahmā may be captured by Māyā, although this is the very objection he raised earlier—that Brahmā is blessed by the Lord and cannot be caught by Māyā.

What to speak of Brahmā, even mother Yaśodā was bewildered by *yogamāyā* when Kṛṣṇa showed her the whole universe within His mouth (*Bhāg.* 10.8.42):

aham mamāsau patir eṣa me suto
 vrajeśvarasyākhila-vitta-pā satī
 gopyaś ca gopāḥ saha-go-dhanāś ca me
 yan-māyayettham ku-matiḥ sa me gatiḥ

It is by the influence of the Supreme Lord's Māyā that I am wrongly thinking I am Yaśodā, Nanda Mahārāja is my husband, Kṛṣṇa is my son, I am the wife of Nanda Mahārāja, all his wealth of cows and calves are my possessions and all the cowherd men and their wives are my subjects. Actually, I also am eternally subordinate to the Supreme Lord. He is my ultimate shelter.

Commenting on this verse, Lāl accepts that the amount of bliss mother Yaśodā experiences in thinking of Kṛṣṇa as her son far surpasses that experienced by considering Him the Supreme Lord. Knowing this, Lord Kṛṣṇa expanded His Vaiṣṇavi-māyā which constitutes His internal potency. And further (10.8.43):

ittham vidita-tattvāyāṁ gopikāyāṁ sa iśvaraḥ
 vaiṣṇavīm vyatanon māyāṁ putra-sneha-mayīm vibhuḥ

In this way when mother Yaśodā, the gopī, understood the real truth, the Supreme Master, the Lord spread His Vaiṣṇavī-māya on mother Yaśodā, who was very affectionate towards Him.

What's more, even Lord Kṛṣṇa was bewildered for a *muhūrta* (48 minutes), while fighting Śālva (*Bhag.* 10.77.23, 24,28):

niśamya vipriyāṁ kṛṣṇo mānuṣīm prakṛtīm gataḥ
 vimanasko ghṛṇī snehād babbhāse prākṛto yathā

kathāṁ rāmam asambhrāntam jitvājeyāṁ surāsuraiḥ
 śālvenālpīyasā nītāḥ pitā me balavān vidhiḥ

tato muhūrtām prakṛtāv upaplutaḥ
 sva-bodha āste sva janānuṣaṅgataḥ
 mahānubhāvas tad abudhyad āśurīm
 māyāṁ sa śālva-prasṛtāṁ mayoditām

When He heard this disturbing news, Lord Kṛṣṇa, who was playing the role of a mortal man, showed sorrow and compassion. Out of love for His parents He spoke the following words like an ordinary conditioned soul,

Balarāma is ever vigilant, and no demigod or demon can defeat Him. So how could this insignificant Śālva defeat Him and abduct My father? Indeed, fate is all powerful.

By nature Lord Kṛṣṇa is full in knowledge, and He has unlimited powers of perception. Yet for a *muhurta*, out of great affection for His loved ones, He remained absorbed in the mood of an ordinary human being. He soon recalled, however, that this was all a demoniac illusion engineered by Maya Dānava and employed by Śālva.

But the ultimate answer to this question is given by Śrī Śukadeva in verse 10.77.32:

*yat-pāda-sevorjitayātma vidyayā
hinvanty anādyātma-viparyaya-graham
labhanta ātmīyam anantam aiśvaram
kuto nu mohah paramasya sad-gateḥ*

By virtue of self-realization fortified by service rendered to His feet, devotees of the Lord dispel the bodily concept of life, which has bewildered souls without beginning. Thus they attain eternal glory in His personal association. How then, can that Supreme Truth, the destination of all genuine saints, be subject to illusion?

Śukadeva's question is rhetorical. It means the Lord can never be bewildered by illusion, but for His pastimes He agrees to become the subject of His own *yogamāyā* potency. One is further advised to consider Lord Brahmā's statement in 2.7.42:

*yeśāṁ sa eṣa bhagavān dayayed anantaḥ
sarvātmanāśrita-pado yadi nirvyalikam
te dustarāṁ atitaranti ca deva-māyām
naiśāṁ mamāham iti dhiḥ sva-śrgāla-bhakṣye*

But anyone who is specifically favored by the Supreme Lord, the Personality of Godhead, due to unalloyed surrender unto the service of the Lord, can overcome the insurmountable ocean of illusion and can understand the Lord, but those who are attached to the body, which is meant to be eaten at the end by dogs and jackals, cannot do so.

Whether Brahmā's bewilderment was because of his forgetfulness of the Lord or by the independent will of the Lord, it

is not against the narrations and principles established in the *Śrīmad-Bhāgavatam*. Further, because this pastime is related in the *Padma Purāṇa*, which is accepted by Lāl, as he quotes the *Padma Purāṇa* in this regard, it cannot be against the conclusions of the scriptures.

As stated earlier, when the Lord wants to enjoy His humanlike pastimes, He takes help from *yogamāyā*. Otherwise He cannot engage in pastimes like stealing butter, feeling hungry, and so on, because He owns everything and hunger cannot touch Him. On the words *ātma-māyā* (*Bhāg.* 10.3.46), the son of Vallabhācārya, Śrī Viṭṭhālnātha, comments:

Just as the illusory energy, Māyā, the cause of material bondage, makes one forget one's real nature and causes attachment to the material world, in the same way this *ātma-māyā* makes a devotee forget his nature (as servant of the Lord) and causes attachment to the Lord (in a particular relationship). Because of the common attribute of making the *jīva* forget his identity, the *ātma-māyā* is also called *māyā*.

Vallabhācārya also says that *māyā* is of three types—*svamohinī*, which bewilders Kṛṣṇa; *svajanamohinī*, which bewilders the devotees; and *vimukhajanamohinī*, which bewilders the nondevotees. In the Gaudīya-sampradāya, *svamohinī* and *svajanamohinī* corresponds to *Yoga-māyā*, which is the Lord's internal potency, and *vimukhājanamohinī* is *Mahā-māyā*, the external potency of the Lord. If Lord Brahmā is bewildered by the internal potency of Lord Kṛṣṇa that is not out of the ordinary; it is consistent with so many other pastimes in the *Śrīmad-Bhāgavatam*.

This also clears up the objection that the Lord did not keep His promise to Lord Brahmā, for His promise was in reference to Māyā and not to *Yoga-māyā*. Moreover, the Lord is independent and supremely powerful. Mundane considerations of morality, ethics and so forth cannot be projected on Him. God is transcendental to all such considerations. Hence, even if He did not keep a promise made to Lord Brahmā, there is no blemish in His divine character. Rather, it becomes yet another facet of His wonderful pastimes. In

this particular case, however, Lāl is proven wrong because the Lord did keep His promise to Lord Brahmā. Lāl has unfortunately confused the Māyā śakti with the *yogamāyā śakti* of the Lord.

E You (Jīva Gosvāmī) are jumping over your own ācāryas and thus you are a rebel, ācārya-drohī, because Śrī Madhvācārya, your own *sampradāya* ācārya, did not accept those chapters nor did Śrī Vijayadhvaja.

RESPONSE



Madhvācārya neither commented on these chapters nor said they were interpolated. If his not commenting on the three disputed chapters is the test of interpolation, then chapters eleven and fifteen, and many others throughout the *Bhāgavatam* should be considered spurious because Madhvācārya did not comment on them either. Vijayadhvaja, an ācārya in the same *sampradāya*, without explanation also did not comment on these chapters and never said they were spurious.

Giridhara Lāl counts Madhvācārya and Vijayadhvaja among those who regard these chapters spurious. Madhvācārya's *Bhāgavatam* comments are brief and on select verses, thus his neglecting to comment on these chapters does not substantiate Lāl's thesis. In the case of Vijayadhvaja, scholars question the edition of *Bhāgavatam* he commented on. In some places it shows extra verses, nay, extra chapters, and in other places many verses are missing. Even Madhvites have doubts about the edition he used. For example, the publisher of *Bhāgavata tātparya* of Śrī Madhvācārya has written:

Although previously the original reading according to Vijayadhvaja was published, which is available, that is neither according to Vijayadhvaja nor according to Bhāṣya (*Bhāgavata tātparya* of Madhvācārya). Vijayadhvaja's reading is strewn with defects. In certain places it appears as if someone who did not have good knowledge of the original has interpolated it and thus it appears doubtful, not very fine, and in places even contradictory to

Bhāgavata tātparya. . . . At present the correct reading of Vijayadhvaja needs to be examined. . . . (*Sārva Mūla Granthā* Volume III, Udupi, 1980.)

Thus writes Govindācārya, a scholarly and staunch follower of Śrī Madhvācārya. Lāl would not have had better access to Madhva-sampradāya's manuscripts than this author.

Śrī Madhvācārya and Vijayadhvaja do not explicitly declare these chapters interpolated, but from the statement of Śrīla Sanātana Gosvāmī it is clear they avoided them. The reason, however, is not because they considered them interpolated but because the chapters go against their philosophical conclusions. Madhvācārya and his followers do not accept that demons killed by Kṛṣṇa can attain liberation. The following verses make it clear, however, that this is not the verdict of *Śrīmad-Bhāgavatam*.

*sa nityadovigna-dhiyā tam īśvaram
pibann adan vā vicaran svapañchvasan
dadarśa cakrāyudham agrato yatas
tad eva rūpam duravāpam āpa*

Kaṁsa was always disturbed by the thought that the Supreme Lord would kill him. Therefore when drinking, eating, moving about, sleeping or simply breathing, the King always saw the Lord before him with the disc weapon in His hand. Thus Kaṁsa achieved the rare boon of attaining a form like the Lord's. (*Bhāg.* 10.44.39)

*tathaiva cānye nara-loka-vīrā
ya āhave kṛṣṇa-mukhāravindam
netraih pibanto nayanābhīrāmam
pārthāstra-pūtāḥ padam āpur asya*

Certainly other fighters on the Battlefield of Kurukṣetra were purified by the onslaught of Arjuna's arrows, and while seeing the lotuslike face of Kṛṣṇa so pleasing to the eyes, they achieved the abode of the Lord. (*Bhāg.* 3.2.20)

*ye vā mṛdhe samiti-śālinā ātta-cāpāḥ
kāmboja-matsya-kuru-srījaya-kaikayādyāḥ
yāsyanty adarśanam alām bala-pārtha-bhīma-
vyājāhvayena hariṇā nilayam tadiyam*

All demonic persons like Pralamba, Dhēnuka, Baka, Keśi, Arīṣṭa, Cāṇūra, Muṣṭīka, Kuvalayapīḍa, Karīṣa, Kālā-Yavana, Narakāsura and Paundraka, great marshals like Śālva, Dvivida, Balvala, Dantavaktra, the seven bulls, Śambara, Vidūratha, and Rukmi, as also great warriors from Kāmboja, Matsya, Kuru, Śrījaya and Kekaya, and other great heroes who would all fight vigorously carrying bows, either with Lord Hari directly or with Him under His names of Baladeva, Arjuna, Bhīma, etc. will attain liberation being killed by the Lord. (*Bhāg. 2.7.34*)

On the strength of these verses one may safely conclude that claims that demons killed by Kṛṣṇa do not attain liberation, or that Pūtanā could not attain the status of the Lord's mother and so forth, are not grounds for rejecting the said chapters as interpolated. Further, although Śrīla Jīva Gosvāmī comes in the Madhva-sampradāya, as a follower of Mahāprabhu Śrī Caitanya, he belongs to an offshoot of Madhva's line. Naturally there are some philosophical differences as evidenced by the *dvaitavāda* of Madhvācārya and the *acintya-bhedābheda-vāda* of Śrīman Mahāprabhu. Hence, to accuse Śrīla Jīva Gosvāmī of being a rebel and envious of previous ācāryas like Śrīla Madhvācārya is unfounded. This is evident from *Anuccheda 28* of *Tattva-Sandarbha* where Śrī Jīva refers to Śrīla Madhvācārya as the prolific preacher of Vaiṣṇava philosophy, the chief among the knowers of the Vedas. Śrīla Jīva Gosvāmī cites Madhvācārya, but he does not promise to accept Madhva's philosophy in all respects. In a case of contention, Jīva Gosvāmī's ultimate fidelity lies with Caitanya Mahāprabhu and not with Madhvācārya.

F You (Jīva Gosvāmī) have said that these three chapters are popular. We ask then whether they are popular among fools, scholars, or both? If they are accepted by fools, then certainly that does not prove their authenticity. If you say it does, then the bodily conception of life should also be accepted. Were they accepted by all scholars there would be no dispute. This automatically negates the third possibility. These chapters cannot be accepted simply because

of popularity, as reasoned by you. Even hundreds of blind men cannot see an object.

RESPONSE



Here Lāl says that if fools accept these chapters and write commentaries on them that does not prove their authenticity. He is clearly implying that all who accept these chapters are fools and those who do not accept are scholars. Who but a fool will accept such definitions? Certainly these chapters are popular among scholars, and Śrīla Jīva Gosvāmī named but a few of them. To raise this question is in poor taste, for no one cites fools to support his case. This simple fact Lāl does not understand, and so he asks, "Are these chapters popular with fools or scholars?"

Among Vedic scholars, especially those who study *Bhāgavatam*, it is accepted that the real test of scholarship is in understanding and commenting on the *Śrīmad-Bhāgavatam*—*vidyāvatām bhāgavate parikṣā*. Persons who comment on *Śrīmad-Bhāgavatam*, therefore, cannot be compared to the fools mired in the bodily conception of life. For example, Bopadeva is said to have studied *Bhāgavatam* twenty times from his teachers before attempting to write his commentary.

Lāl suggests that if hundreds of fools claim the disputed chapters bona fide, that does not make them so; but by the same token, if hundreds of fools say these chapters are interpolated, that does not make them so either. This reasoning cannot apply to the stalwart scholars who have commented on *Bhāgavatam*. If Lāl insists that it does apply, then he should first have proven his immunity from this blindness. Calling *Bhāgavatam* commentators fools is not a scholarly trait.



Moreover Vyāsa Bhaṭṭa, the son of Śrī Rāmānuja's disciple, rejected these chapters in his *Śuka pakṣiyam* commentary on *Śrīmad-Bhāgavatam*. Following in his footsteps, Śrī Vīrarāghavācārya must have considered them spurious, although he commented on them because of their popularity.

RESPONSE



Here, by citing the examples of Vyāsa Bhaṭṭa and Vīrarāghavācārya, Lāl cites popularity as an argument to refute Śrīla Jīva Gosvāmī's acceptance of the three chapters. Earlier Lāl tried to refute Śrīla Jīva Gosvāmī's argument of accepting them based on popularity. Thus Lāl contradicts himself by arguing for their popularity to support his view. The interesting thing is that Vīrarāghavācārya says,

*ita ārabhya adhyāya-trayāṇ prakṣiptam, iti vyāsācāryair
upeikṣitam tathāpi prāyaśo vyavahriyamāṇatvāt kaiścid
vyākhyatatvācca vyākhyāyate.*

Vyāsa Bhaṭṭa has not commented on them considering them spurious, but because these chapters are in vogue and have thus been commented on by some, I am also commenting on them." (Bhāgavat Candrikā 10.12.1)

Vīrarāghava comments on these chapters because they are popular but Lāl cites Vīrarāghava to attempt to prove the chapters spurious. Vīrarāghava makes no explicit mention that he considers the three chapters spurious. One may say that explicit mention is not necessary as the above quote clearly shows implicit agreement with Vyāsa Bhaṭṭa. The fact, however, is that in 12.12.28 Vīrarāghava accepts part of the verse that mentions these *līlās* quoted earlier and he comments: *Niśpeṣo vadhaḥ aghāsurasya susamhāra. . .* 'Niśpeṣa means slaying. Kṛṣṇa killed the demon Aghāsura.' This indicates that he did not consider the three chapters interpolated, rather he just mentioned that Vyāsa Bhaṭṭa considered them interpolated.

H According to *Padma Purāṇa*, the propagators of the Vaiṣṇava *saṃpradāyas* in the line of Laksmīdevī and Lord Brahmā are Rāmānuja and Madhvācārya. They consider these chapters spurious. If you do not accept the opinion of Śrī Madhvācārya, then your *saṃpradāya* becomes a mere cult.

RESPONSE

In fact it is Lāl and his ācāryas who reject the opinion of the Śrī and Madhva-sampradāya ācāryas who have all commented on the six verses beginning with 10.6.35. Still, Vallabha and his followers insist these verses are spurious. In his commentary on 10.6.35 Lāl writes:

atra yadyapi 'dahyamānasya dehasya' ity asya ślokasya 'kaṭa-dhūmasya' ity anenāsaṅgateḥ spaṣṭattvāt tan madhye ṣaṭ ślokāḥ prakṣiptā ity āhuh śrī-mad-ācāryās tathāpi sarva-pustakeṣu darśanāt te'pi vyākhyāyante.

Here, although the verse beginning from *dahya mānasya dehasya* (10.6.35) goes along with the one beginning *kaṭadhūmasya* (10.6.41) and the six verses in between are interpolated according to Śrī Vallabhācārya, yet they are seen in all books and thus I comment on them.

In his opinion the verses are so popular that he is forced to comment on them. Here he specifically says that these verses are found in all editions—*sarva-pustakeṣu*. Of the two ācāryas, Rāmānuja and Madhvācārya, Śrī Rāmānuja did not write a commentary on *Bhāgavatam*, and, as stated earlier, Madhvācārya did not directly say that these three chapters were interpolated. He simply did not write any commentary on them. And some followers of Rāmānuja, like Sudarśana Sūri and Vīrarāghava have commented on these chapters.

No further comment is needed on this. In fact, although Vallabhācārya and his followers consider the three chapters spurious, many commentators in their line, including Vallabhācārya and Giridhara Lāl, have commented on them, giving the excuse that they are popular among scholars and the masses. Yet Lāl posed a question whether these chapters are popular among scholars or fools to attack Śrīla Jīva Gosvāmī. Even if they are popular among the masses, if the chapters are in fact interpolated, further commentary will only further mislead others. The conclusion is that these commentators were not themselves convinced that the said

chapters are interpolated. They were unable to reconcile them, thus they propagated the interpolation theory.

I You (Jīva Gosvāmī) quoted verse 3.15.23, to prove that the word *aghabhit* indicates killing of Aghāsura. Here the suitable meaning is "the dispeller of sins" and that fits in the context. In *Śrīmad-Bhāgavatam* the usage of the word *agha* means sin. (Lāl quotes many verses to support this, two of which are 6.2.8 and 6.2.11:

*etenaiva hy aghono 'sya kṛtam syād agha-niṣkṛtam
yadā nārāyanāyeti jagāda catur-akṣaram*

The Viṣṇudūtas continued: Even previously, while eating and at other times, this Ajāmila would call his son, saying, "My dear Nārāyaṇa, please come here." Although calling the name of his son, he nevertheless uttered the four syllables nā-rā-ya-na. Simply by chanting the name of Nārāyaṇa in this way, he sufficiently atoned for the sinful reactions of millions of lives.

*na niskrtair uditair brahma-vādibhiḥ
tathā viśuddhyaty agha-vān vratādibhiḥ
yathā harer nāma-padair udāhṛtais
tad uttama-śloka-guṇopalambhakam*

By following the Vedic ritualistic ceremonies or undergoing atonement, sinful men do not become as purified as by chanting once the holy name of Lord Hari. Although ritualistic atonement may free one from sinful reactions, it does not awaken devotional service, unlike the chanting of the Lord's names, which reminds one of the Lord's fame, qualities, attributes, pastimes and paraphernalia.

RESPONSE

There is no truth in the statement that the word *aghabhit* means only "dispeller of sin" and not "the killer of Aghāsura." It can even have both meanings simultaneously as Aghāsura is the personification of sin. Vallabhācārya accepts that the demons killed by Kṛṣṇa represent various lower human

qualities. Since *Bhāgavatam* is a *kāvya*, a poetical composition, it uses indirect methods to convey instruction. This was explained in *Anuccheda 26* of *Tattva-Sandarbha*.

Generally, proper nouns used in *Śrimad-Bhāgavatam* also have meanings related to their qualities. For instance, Bhīṣma also means "ferocious in fighting"; and Arjuna "one with pure character." So no Vedic injunction prohibits *aghābhīt* as being taken as a name of Kṛṣṇa—the killer of Aghāsura. Vallabhācārya and other commentators, including Lāl, often give such double meanings to Kṛṣṇa's names. For example Śrī Vallabhācārya considers Pūtanā the personification of ignorance. He writes, *avidyā-pūtanāhaṣṭā-pūtana*, "ignorance was killed" (*Subodhini* 10.6.13); and *nava viṣeṣanāni prākṛta-guṇānāṁ sarveṣāṁ samavāyārthāni*, *avidyā hi navadhā bhīṣikā*, "The nine adjectives in this verse describing Pūtanā represent all material qualities collectively. Ignorance causes fear in nine ways" (*Subodhini* 10.6.16).

That the demons were personifications of lower qualities is also substantiated in *Śrī Kṛṣṇopaniṣad* (14,15) *dveṣaścānūra-mallo'yaṁ matsaro muṣṭiko jayah. . . . aghāsuro mahā vyādhiḥ kaliḥ karṇsah sa bhūpatih*: "The wrestler Cānūra is the personification of hatred and Muṣṭika is the personification of envy. Aghāsura is the personification of disease resulting from sin, and King Karṇsa is Kali." Therefore, the meaning Śrī Jīva has given to *aghābhīt*—the killer of Aghāsura—is not improper.

J Śrīdhara Svāmī has explained the term *mātarah*—mothers, in verse 10.6.36. He says the plural form is used to remind one of the pastime of Brahmā's stealing the calves—*vatsa-harana-līlā*. During this pastime Lord Kṛṣṇa expanded Himself to become the sons of the *gopīs* and thus He treated them as His mothers. This makes it improper for Him to perform *rāsa-līlā* with the *gopīs* as it is improper to dance with one's mother. This proves these six verses are spurious.

RESPONSE



Śrīdhara Svāmī's explanation is proper but Lāl's conclusion is wrong. The *Bhāgavatam* doesn't state that the *gopīs* Kṛṣṇa related to as mother during the *Brahma-vimohana līlā* were the same ones He danced with in the *rāsa-līlā*. According to the principles set forth in *rasa-śāstra* this would be considered *rasābhāsa* and be frowned upon by knowers of *rasa*. Since Kṛṣṇa is the supreme taster of *rasa*, it is foolish to think He would perform such an act. Obviously, He performed the *rāsa-līlā* with *gopīs* other than the ones He treated as mother.

The *Śrīmad-Bhāgavatam* is the mature fruit of the Vedic tree of knowledge and is called the *amala-purāṇa*, the spotless scripture and thus cannot contain *rasābhāsa*. Lāl's criticism is unfounded and reveals he is not knowledgeable in the science of *rasa*.

K Śrīdhara Svāmī explained these chapters out of custom, and in the same spirit he took the term *vyālā-rākṣasāt* as Aghāsura (10.31.3). Actually it refers to the Kāliya serpent and demons like Trṇāvarta. In the beginning of the Tenth Canto he claims there are ninety chapters in it, but this is also done only out of custom. He indicates this in his invocation to the First Canto, *saṃpradāyānurodhena, paurvāparyānusārataḥ*— "keeping strict adherence to the *saṃpradāya* and maintaining harmony between the earlier and later parts of the book." Thus he commented on all ninety chapters. *Sampradāya* refers to Bopadeva and others who accepted ninety chapters. By *paurvāparāvirodhena*, or reconciling the earlier and later statements, he means that there are 332 chapters.

RESPONSE



The logic given in this argument is childish. How does a critic know that Śrīdhara Svāmī explained these chapters out of custom when Śrīdhara Svāmī himself never declared

them spurious? In his commentary on *Bhāgavatam*, Śrīdhara Svāmī mentions the verses he considered interpolated. One such example is 1.15.8. Then why would he be so uncharacteristically enigmatic about these three chapters in the Tenth Canto, which is in the very heart of the *Bhāgavatam*?

In his invocation to the Tenth Canto he mentions twice that there are 90 chapters therein and does not say a word about interpolation. Still Lāl dares to misinterpret his invocatory statements *sampradāyānurodhena, paurvā-paryānusārataḥ*. The direct meaning is "I (Śrīdhara Svāmī) will give the meaning (explain the significance) as I have studied in my *guru paramparā* and there will be no contradictions in the earlier and later sections."

These are the natural qualities of a good commentary. Lāl's theory that Śrīdhara Svāmī acted only to conform with custom yet factually disagreed with his own statements is completely beyond our understanding. If that is the case then Śrīdhara Svāmī is following *sampradāya* in name only. Even so, why does he bother to explain the word *mātarah*, in verse 10.6.36, as related with *brahma-vimohana līlā* if he does not believe in it? Rather it goes against his promise that his explanation will have no internal contradictions.

Moreover, even if he has explained these chapters only out of custom while lacking conviction, then we must believe that the custom of accepting these chapters was quite prominent. This custom must be among scholars because Śrīdhara Svāmī could not ignore it. This then lends support to the fact that these chapters are part of *Śrīmad-Bhāgavatam*. Śrīdhara Svāmī never explicitly mentions that these chapters are interpolated.

Thus we conclude that Śrīdhara Svāmī has no objection to these chapters and accordingly he translates the word *vyāla rākṣasa* in verse 10.31.3 as Aghāsura. Similarly, in commenting on the word *mahāśanaiḥ* in verse 10.2.1 he mentions that many have translated it as Aghāsura. Vallabhācārya in his commentary, *Subodhini*, accepts that *mahāsana* could mean either a glutton or Aghāsura. All these facts lead to one conclusion, that none of the 335 chapter of *Śrīmad-Bhāgavatam* are interpolations.

L At this point Lāl tries to refute Śrīla Jīva Gosvāmī's explanation of the phrase *dvātrimśat triśatam*, which is used by Śrīdhara Svāmī in one of his invocatory verses. Since Lāl's explanation is all based on intricate grammatical rules, and only one who has studied Pāṇini grammar can understand it, I bypass it in favor of stating his conclusion, which is that the *Bhāgavatam* has 332 chapters. He says the number is usually stated for the readers' easy understanding and that Śrīla Jīva Gosvāmī's explanation is very difficult and defeats the very purpose of giving the number. Hence the direct meaning, 332, is more logical. Thus, Lāl proposes that Śrīdhara Svāmī considers these chapters spurious, and beyond that, owing to various defects in them, declares the said chapters interpolated.

- RESPONSE -



Here again, Lāl has misunderstood and failed to present convincing arguments to reject these chapters. Śrīla Jīva Gosvāmī has grammatically explained the meaning of the phrase *dvātrimśat triśatam* as 335. Since the refutation of Lāl's objection to this section is beyond the scope of those who have not studied Pāṇini Sanskrit Grammar, we will not go into it. Śrīla Jīva Gosvāmī is not the only one who takes the phrase to mean 335.

Around 1870 Varnśīdhara wrote an explanation of the commentary of Śrīdhara Svāmī called *Bhāvārtha-dīpikā-prakāśa*. Not much is known about his lineage, but he was definitely a Vaiṣṇava. He quoted copiously from the work of Jīva Gosvāmī and Viśvanātha Cakravartī Thākura. He agrees that the above phrase means 335, *dvā-trimśat ca śatāni ceti tripada-dvandvah... tena pañca-trimśad-adhika-śata-traya-saṅkhyākāḥ sākhā ity arthah*. Indeed he wrote a separate explanation of this, which he mentioned in his commentary on Śrīdhara Svāmī. Unfortunately that book is lost.

Lāl's statement that the number of chapters is mentioned for the easy understanding of the reader is indeed correct. He argues that it is improper to give a complicated grammatical

explanation to prove the phrase means 335. This would have been a good argument had the verse in question (invocation verse six) been composed by Śrīdhara Svāmī, however, it is cited from the *Padma Purāṇa*, *Uttarakhanda* 198.51. Sanat Kumāra, who is one of the greatest *jñānīs*, spoke this verse to Nārada Muni, who is no fool. One can expect indirect statements from the Kumāras. Lord Kṛṣṇa relishes when the sages speak indirectly (*Bhāg.11.21.35*):

*vedā brahmātma viṣayāḥ tri-kāṇḍa viṣayā īme
parokṣa-vādā ṛṣayāḥ parokṣarāṇi mama ca priyam*

The Vedas, divided into three divisions, ultimately reveal the living entity as pure spirit soul. The Vedic seers and *mantras*, however, deal in esoteric terms, and I also am pleased by such indirect confidential descriptions.

Indirect statements are not to be accepted as they appear, but need interpretation. An example of this are the verses :

*yayāharad bhūvo bhāraṇi tāṁ tanum vijahāv ajah
kaṇṭakarāṇi kaṇṭakena eva dvayam cāpiśītuḥ samam*

The supreme unborn, Lord Śrī Kṛṣṇa, caused the members of the Yadu dynasty to relinquish their bodies, through whom He relieved the burden of the world. This action was like picking out a thorn with a thorn and then throwing them both away, not seeing any difference between the two. (*Bhāg. 1.15.34*)

*yathā matsyādi rūpāṇi dhatte jahyād yathā nataḥ
bhū-bhāraḥ kṣapito yena jahau tac ca kalevaram*

The Supreme Lord relinquished the body which He manifested to diminish the burden of the earth. Just like a magician, He relinquishes one body to accept different ones, like the fish incarnation and others. (*Bhāg. 1.15.35*)

Here every commentator has interpreted the words *vijahāv tanum* (gave up the body) and *jahau kalevaram* (gave up his body) as giving up the *bhāva*, or mood, and not the body itself, because the Lord's giving up His body does not make sense and goes against the philosophy of the *Bhāgavatam*.

For similar reasons Śrīla Jīva Gosvāmī has interpreted the phrase from Śrīdhara Svāmī's invocation, which only seems to mean 332, because actually there are 335 chapters. Also it is against the rules of Sanskrit grammar to translate *dvātrīṁśat triśatam* as 332.

Moreover, in the beginning of the Tenth Canto, Śrīdhara Svāmī writes that the *Bhāgavatam* has ninety chapters glorifying Lord Kṛṣṇa in the Tenth Canto, *kṛtā navatiradhyāyā daśame kṛṣṇa-kīrttaye*. (*Bhāvārtha-dīpikā* 10.1.1). After this he gives the break down of the ninety chapters, *evam navatiradhyāyā daśame viśadarthakāḥ*, "In this way the ninety chapters in the Tenth Canto contain detailed descriptions." Although Śrīdhara Svāmī has twice stated that the Tenth Canto has ninety chapters, Lāl insists that he means eighty-seven, yet he accuses Śrīla Jīva Gosvāmī of going against the previous *ācāryas*.

M Jīva Gosvāmī has said: "Since the attainment of liberation by demons Kṛṣṇa killed does not conflict with Vaiṣṇava principles, why not accept these three chapters." This statement contradicts Vijayadhvaja Tīrtha of the Madhva-sampradāya who explains that Pūtanā went to hell. He takes the word *jananīgati* (destination of a mother) to mean the place attained by sinners. Thus Mādhwites, who are your predecessors, do not accept that demons killed by Kṛṣṇa attain liberation.

The line *sad-veṣad-iva pūtanā* (*Bhāg.* 10.14.35—which states that Pūtanā attained liberation by appearing in the dress of a devotee, meaning *gopī*) is from the interpolated chapters and thus cannot be accepted as authoritative.

RESPONSE

— ◊ —

This objection is automatically answered by the response given to "E". When Lāl himself writes that demons killed by Kṛṣṇa get liberation, there is no sense in citing Vijayadhvaja's opinion on the matter. How can he expect to argue both sides of the issue?

Verse 10.14.35 may be from the disputed three chapters, but there are many other verses which state that demons killed by Kṛṣṇa attain liberation (*Bhāg.* 10.2.23):

*aho bakīyāṁ stana-kāla-kūṭāṁ jīghāṁsayāpāyayad apyasaṁdhvī
lebhe gatīṁ dhamātrūcītāṁ tato'nyāṁ karī vā dayālūṁ śaranām vrajema*

The sinful Pūtanā smeared deadly poison on her breasts and offered them to Kṛṣṇa with the intention of killing Him. Even to her the Lord gave the post of nurse. Then who else is more merciful than Him whose shelter we can take?

Commenting on this verse Lāl himself accepts that Pūtanā attained liberation. *Dhātryā yaśodāyā ucitāṁ tad dhāma-prāpti-rūpāṁ gatīṁ lebhe prāpatavatī. Evam aparādhavatyā api yo muktiṁ dattavān.* "Dhātryā, or nurse, means 'of Yaśodā' who attained the abode of the Lord. The Lord who gave liberation even to she who was an offender."

N Vallabhācārya has accepted that the demons in these instances attained liberation though not the same destination of the devotees. You agree with this so you cannot blame our ācārya.

RESPONSE



We have no objection to this. Śrīla Jīva Gosvāmī never blames Vallabhācārya anywhere in his discussion on the number of chapters in *Bhāgavatam*.

O You argue that since the killing of Aghāsura and the bewilderment of Lord Brahmā are both mentioned in the *Padma* and other *Purāṇas*, this authenticates the appearance of these *līlās* in the *Bhāgavatam*. But since the *Padma Purāṇa* mentions these *līlās* without giving details and makes no mention that they appear in *Śrīmad-Bhāgavatam*, this fails to offer any substantial support to your case.

RESPONSE

The fact that these *līlās* are mentioned in other *Purāṇas* serves to prove that they did occur and are not a concoction. Thus there is every possibility of them appearing in *Śrīmad-Bhāgavatam*, which Vyāsadeva wrote specifically to narrate the pastimes of Lord Kṛṣṇa. Verses 1.5.36, 1.5.39, 1.7.7, 1.7.10 and 1.7.12 clearly establish that *Bhāgavatam* was mainly compiled to narrate the pastimes of Lord Kṛṣṇa, the Supreme Personality of Godhead. In fact these verses confirm that *līlās* barely referred to in the *Padma* and other *Purāṇas*, are elaborately described in the *Bhāgavatam*. And because these pastimes are found in other *sāttvika Purāṇas* their philosophical conclusions have to be accepted. Otherwise Lāl and others have to explain why these *līlās* are described in other *sāttvika Purāṇas*.

P It is not proper to reason that these *līlās* are included in the *Bhāgavatam* just because they are wonderful. If this is the standard, then the wonderful *līlās* from *Hari Varmśa*, *Viṣṇu* and *Brahma-vaivarta Purāṇas* should also be included.

RESPONSE

This is Vallabhācārya's argument. He proposed that since these *līlās* are wonderful, some scholar included them in *Śrīmad-Bhāgavatam* to woo the readers, yet offered no proof. Thus Lāl has made the error of building his case with unsubstantiated evidence. Furthermore, Śrīla Jīva Gosvāmī never argued that these pastimes were included owing to being wonderful.

Q The fact that the places associated with these *līlās* are found in *Vṛndāvana* does not prove the *līlās* are a legitimate part of *Śrīmad-Bhāgavatam*. If so, then other *līlās* related with places such as Rādhā-kuṇḍa, Lukaluka Kāṇḍara, and so on, should also be included.

RESPONSE

Śrīla Jīva Gosvāmī used this reason to support his logic as explained in the response to item "O." He is not exclusively using this logic to support his case. It is not that because places associated with these *līlās* are found in Vṛndāvana that the *līlās* are considered part of *Śrīmad-Bhāgavatam*; rather, because the *līlās* are mentioned in the *Bhāgavatam*, places associated with them are found in Vṛndāvana. This confirms the authenticity of the descriptions found in the *Bhāgavatam*.

R The explanation that those *gopīs* whose breasts Lord Kṛṣṇa suckled were of the same age as mother Yaśodā, and the *gopīs* with whom He performed *rāsa-līlā* were young is not satisfying to scholars. There is no such rule that only the *gopīs* equal in age to Yaśodā had sons and not the young *gopīs*.

According to verse 10.5.23, Yaśodā gave birth to Kṛṣṇa in her old age, and even Lord Brahmā will not claim that all the *gopīs* who had sons were as elderly as Yaśodā. The cowherd boys were the same age as Kṛṣṇa and thus their mothers would have been young. It is highly improper that Kṛṣṇa would engage in *rāsa-līlā* with them after having drunk their breast milk during the one year period of *brahma-vimohana-līlā*. So *vatsa-harana līlā* is spurious. Also, it is ludicrous that boys around five years old would feed on breast milk.

RESPONSE

In his *Vaiṣṇava Toṣaṇī* commentary on 10.29.6, Śrī Jīva explains that the *gopīs* who danced with Kṛṣṇa had no sons, otherwise *rasābhāṣa* would result. The statement that they were feeding milk *pāyayantah* *śiśūn* (10.29.6) does not necessarily mean nursing their own children. Śrī Jīva says they were feeding milk to the children of their brothers or sisters. Jīva Gosvāmī did not say all the *gopīs* who had sons the same age as Kṛṣṇa were elderly like Yaśodā. He says the

gopīs with whom Kṛṣṇa engaged in conjugal pastimes are different from those who nursed Him. Whether the *gopīs* who nursed Kṛṣṇa were elderly or young is not the issue. When he says that they were of the same age as mother Yaśodā, he means they were elderly, not precisely the same age. This is explained in detail in *Vaiṣṇava toṣanī*.

It is not ludicrous at all that these five-year-old boys drank breast milk, as they were actually Kṛṣṇa, who is *acintya*. He is inconcievable in every respect. He does not have to conform to our conception of what ordinary boys do. He may act as an ordinary boy, but at any moment he can do something extraordinary. At age seven He lifted Govardhana Hill and performed *rāsa-līlā*. Similarly, to please His devotees He may drink breast milk at age five. Actually, the milk He drank was love in liquid form. It is a medical fact that milk can appear in a woman's breast under certain extraordinary circumstances, such as during intense feelings of love. Furthermore, according to *Śrīmad-Bhāgavatam* (4.9.50), when Dhruva Mahārāja returned home after his penances in Madhuvana and met his mother, Sunīti, milk flowed from her breasts—*payah stanābhyaṁ susrāva netrajaiḥ salilaiḥ śivaiḥ*. Dhruva was six years old at that time. Similarly, out of love for Kṛṣṇa milk would flow from Yaśodā's breasts even when Kṛṣṇa was past the age of drinking breast milk. A number of *Bhāgavatam* verses attest to this phenomenon:

*krīdantāṁ sā sutāṁ bālāir ati-velāṁ sahāgrajam
yaśodājohavīt kṛṣṇāṁ putra-sneha-snuta-stanī*

Kṛṣṇa and Balarāma, being attached to Their play, were playing with the other boys although it was very late. Therefore mother Yaśodā called Them back for lunch. Because of her ecstatic love and affection for Kṛṣṇa and Balarāma, milk flowed from her breasts. (*Bhāg.10.11.14*)

*kṛṣṇa kṛṣṇāravindākṣa tāta ehi stanāṁ piba
alam vihāraih kṣut-kṣāntaiḥ krīdā-śrānto 'si putraka*

Mother Yaśodā said: My dear son Kṛṣṇa, lotus-eyed Kṛṣṇa, come here and drink the milk of my breast. My dear darling, You must be very tired because of hunger

and fatigue from playing so long. There is no need to play any more (*Bhāg.* 10.11.15).

*yaśodā varnyamānāni putrasya caritāni ca
śrīnvanty aśrūṇy avāsrākṣit sneha-snuta-payodharā*

As mother Yaśodā heard the descriptions of her son's activities, she poured out her tears, and milk flowed from her breasts out of love. (*Bhāg.* 10.46.28):

This happens when Kṛṣṇa had left for Mathurā, which means He was more than eleven years old.

*tāḥ putram aṅkam āropya sneha-snuta-payodharāḥ
harṣa-vihvalitātmānah siśicur netrajair jalaiḥ*

The mothers, after embracing their son, sat Him on their laps. Due to pure affection, milk sprang from their breasts. They were overwhelmed with delight, and the tears from their eyes wetted the Lord. (*Bhāg.* 1.11.29):

According to Śrīla Rūpa Gosvāmī in the *Bhakti-rasāmṛta-sindhu* (3.4.45), the flowing of breast milk is the ninth *sāttvika bhāva* in *vātsalya-rasa*—*navātra sāttvikāḥ stanya-srāvah stambhādayaśca te*—when Kṛṣṇa manifested as the cowherd boys in *brahma-vimohana līlā*, the *gopīs* manifested this ninth *sāttvika bhāva* and fed breast milk to Kṛṣṇa who was disguised as the cowherd boys. This is described in 10.13.22.

These verses describe Lord Kṛṣṇa's activities after the *dāma-bandhana-līlā*. During this pastime Lord Kṛṣṇa ran from mother Yaśodā who was unable to catch Him. Certainly he was no longer a crawling baby fed on breast milk. If it is possible for elderly mother Yaśodā to have breast milk, then why not for the younger *gopīs* when Kṛṣṇa came to them disguised as their sons?

S The statement that the girlfriends of Kṛṣṇa were of the same age is also untenable because the *Ādi Purāṇa* mentions that the young *gopīs* desired to enjoy with Kṛṣṇa, who was just a small boy.

RESPONSE

The *Ādi Purāṇa* may have such statements and perhaps refers to a different *kalpa*, but this is not the principle in *Śrīmad-Bhāgavatam*. And even so, the *Ādi Purāṇa* only states that the young *gopīs* desired to enjoy with baby Kṛṣṇa but does not state that they did. The combination of a five-year-old lover and grown up woman is counted as *rasābhāsa* according to the *Sāhitya sāstra* which gives us the rules of poetics.

According to *Sāhitya darpana*, a standard book of *rasa* theology, if the *rati* (attachment) is existing in only one partner (*alambana-vibhāva*), that causes *rasābhāsa*, a disturbance to the proper ebb and flow of transcendental mellows. *Bahunāyaka-visyāyām ratau tathānubhaya-niṣṭhāyām* (S.d. 3.263) If a heroine has *rati* for many heroes, if *rati* exists only in the hero or only in the heroine then it is considered an improper situation for *rasa*. Hence, if the grown up *gopīs* were to enjoy conjugal love with child Kṛṣṇa that would be improper. Their relationship is then marred with *rasābhāsa*. According to *Bhakti-rasāmṛta-sindhu* this is called *vibhāva vairūpya*, or improper combination of lovers (Brs. 4.8.13).

Rasikas, or those who are expert in tasting *rasa*, such as Śukadeva Gosvāmī, frown on such possibilities and it is not possible that *rasābhāsa* appears in the *Śrīmad-Bhāgavatam*, which is glorified as the *amala-purāṇam*, free from all defects (*Bhāg.* 12.13.18).

According to *Śrīmad Bhāgavatam* 1.1.3, *rasikas* are recommended to taste this *rasa-sāstra*—*pibata bhāgavatam rasam*. Others, ignorant of the intricacies of *rasa*, may take pleasure in reading *rasābhāsa*.

T According to the *Amarakośa*, *ānganā* means a young woman, and it is used in various places in *Śrīmad-Bhāgavatam* to indicate the *gopīs* (*vrajānganā*). This usage defeats the argument that the *gopīs* were of the same age as Yaśodā.

You (*Śrīla Jīva Gosvāmī*) say there are no statements in the disputed chapters that contradict those of other chapters

of *Śrīmad-Bhāgavatam*; rather the statements establish the glories of the devotees of the Lord and that this understanding is realized by the special favor of the Lord. Such ideas may be welcome by your friends and followers but we see many contradictions.

RESPONSE

We have no objection to interpreting *āṅganā* as young damsel, because Kṛṣṇa did perform the *rāsa* dance with such *vrajāṅganās*. Its use in 10.8.24, however, refers to *gopīs* who witnessed the childhood pastimes of Kṛṣṇa who were both young and elderly. Why would the elderly *gopīs* not enjoy witnessing His *bāla-līlā*? *Āṅganā* can also refer to women in general, so the claim that it exclusively means young women is not accurate.

The real meaning of *āṅganā* is "a woman with beautiful limbs" (*praśastāni āṅgāni yasyāḥ sa āṅganā*—Rāmāsvāmī commentary on *Amarkośa* 3.6.5). According to this definition, though Yaśodā is elderly, she is *āṅganā* and her beauty is described in verses 10.9.3,10 where she is referred to as *śubhru*, "one with beautiful eyebrows," and *sumadhyamā*, "one with a beautiful waist." Thus Lāl's objection that the *gopīs* who nursed Kṛṣṇa could not be elderly owing to being referred to as *āṅganā* is refuted.

U Verse 10.12.29 describes that the demigods became unhappy and demons like Karṇa became happy when Kṛṣṇa entered the mouth of Aghāsura. This infers that Karṇa witnessed the killing of Aghāsura. Later, in verse 10.36.18, Nārada narrates to Karṇa the killing of these demons which seems inappropriate, since he had seen the killing of Aghāsura. This proves that the Twelfth Chapter of the Tenth Canto is not part of the *Śrīmad-Bhāgavatam*, as it does not fit properly.

RESPONSE

Nārada's narration to Karṇa regarding the killing of Aghāsura might be inappropriate if Karṇa had inquired about it.

However, Nārada volunteered the information so there is no contradiction. Nārada Muni did not read Karīṣa's mind and then think, "Karīṣa already knows about the killing of Aghāsura, having witnessed it, so there is no need to narrate it." Moreover, there is no proof that Karīṣa witnessed the killing of all the demons. And even if he witnessed all of them, and Nārada knew it, there is nothing wrong in narrating them again because his purpose was to incite Karīṣa's anger so that he would immediately call Kṛṣṇa and Balarāma to Mathurā.

Even if Karīṣa had not seen the killing of Aghāsura, he knew that Kṛṣṇa killed the demons sent to Vraja. This is evident from the following verses:

*karīṣena prahitā ghorā putanā bāla ghātinī
śiśūṁś cacāra nighnanti pura-grāma-vrajādiṣu*

While Nanda Mahārāja was returning to Gokula, the same fierce Pūtanā whom Karīṣa had previously engaged to kill babies was wandering about in the towns, cities, and villages, doing her nefarious duty. (*Bhāg.10.6.2*)

*daityo nāmnā trīṇī-vartah karīṣa-bhṛtyah pranoditah
cakravāta-svarūpēna jahārāśinam arbhakam*

While the child was sitting on the ground, a demon named Trīṇīvarta, who was a servant of Karīṣa's, came there as a whirlwind, at Karīṣa's instigation, and very easily carried the child away into the air. (*Bhāg.10.7.20*)

He was sending demons one after another who were getting killed as is evident from the above verses. Even if the Twelfth Chapter, Tenth Canto is discarded, Lāl is still left with his objection. Somehow he overlooked this fact out of zeal.

Another reason why Lāl's objection is baseless is that verse 10.12.29 does not actually mean that Karīṣa personally saw Lord Kṛṣṇa entering the mouth of Aghāsura and felt elated. Rather, the demons headed by Karīṣa, *karīṣādyah*, who witnessed this act, felt jubilant. It is not necessary that Karīṣa was personally present. It could also mean that Karīṣa got the news through his spies and felt happy. Lāl also explained it in this very way in his commentary:

*tadā ghana-cchadā devā bhayād dhā-heti cukruśuh
jahṛsur ye ca karṇsādyāḥ kaunapāś tv agha-bāndhavāḥ*

At that time the demigods who were hiding behind the clouds cried out "Alas! Alas!" out of fear. But the friends of Aghāsura, the meat eating demons headed by Karṇsa felt elated. (*Bhāg.* 10.12.29)

Lāl comments:

*karṇsa ādirmukhyo niyantā yeśām te kaunapāḥ
kuṇapāśinā rākṣasāstu jahṛsuryanvayah...cāraḥ sadyah
eva gatvā kathanāt karṇsādī nāmapi tajjñānamiti jñeyam.*

The demons who are called *kaunapā* because they eat corpses (*kuṇapa*) and whose controller or chief is Karṇsa became happy. This is the proper arrangement of words. The messengers immediately went and informed Karṇsa, therefore Karṇsa also knew about it.

It is surprising that even after Lāl comments in this way, he raises an objection based on Karṇsa's personal presence.

V Chapter Twelve, verses 26 and 27, describe that the Lord knew the cowherd boys were unknowingly entering the mouth of the great python Aghāsura and wanted to stop them. The Lord was surprised that they entered anyway and considered this to be an act of Fate.

This is entirely against the personality of the Lord who is the controller of fate and is called *satya-saṅkalpa*, or one who has an unfailing will. If He has to marvel at Fate then we should worship Fate and not Kṛṣṇa. Moreover, the devotees are controlled by the will of the Lord and not by Fate. This has been established by an ācārya (Śrīla Viśvanātha Cakravartī Ṭhākura) of your *śāśvata* in *Mādhurya Kādambini*.

Verses 10.13.16, 17 explain that after the calves and cowherd boys were stolen, Lord Kṛṣṇa did not understand what had happened to them. Later on He could understand the reality. This type of ignorance is not possible in Lord Kṛṣṇa, who is called *sarvajña* and *sarvavit* in the *Vedas*—the all-knowing person.

RESPONSE



It was explained in response to "D" that the Lord has three types of *māyā*. One of them is *sva-mohinī*, or which bewilders even the Lord. If the Lord always remains fully conscious of His magnificence, He will not be able to manifest His sweet humanlike pastimes. For the sake of *līlā* He becomes covered by His own *māyā* and so do His devotees. Thus both the Lord and His devotees may appear covered by ignorance, but this is only to accommodate the inconceivable pastimes of Kṛṣṇa. Lord Kṛṣṇa performs humanlike pastimes, which means He does not manifest His *aiśvarya* and that's why His pastimes are most pleasing—(*līlā-mādhuri* is one of the four special characteristics found only in Kṛṣṇa).

W Since you (Jīva Gosvāmī) have disrespected the predecessor *ācāryas* there is absolutely no possibility that you have received even a drop of mercy of the Lord; rather you are envious of both *guru* and *Bhagavān*. So to say that these pastimes are very confidential and that they are understood by the special mercy of the Lord is a foolish statement uttered out of excessive pride and befitting only people like you. Since Bopadeva accepts these chapters, he falls in the same class. The conclusion of the intelligentsia is that only people with blind faith accept these chapters as part of *Śrīmad-Bhāgavatam*.

RESPONSE



Śrīla Jīva Gosvāmī has not disrespected the previous *ācāryas*. Although he comes in line from Madhvācārya, he is a follower of Lord Caitanya's *acintya-bhedābheda*, which has some differences with the *dvaitavāda* of Madhvācārya. It is meaningless to assert that Śrīla Jīva Gosvāmī is envious of *guru* and *Bhagavān*. He has shown that these chapters naturally fit in *Śrīmad-Bhāgavatam* and explain the Lord's wonderful *līlās*. This is in accordance to the will of Lord Caitanya. So how can he be envious of the Lord?

In this way I have addressed in brief the major objections that Chapters Twelve through Fourteen of the Tenth Canto Twelve are not authentic and shown that Giridhara Lāl's claims are all unfounded. As explained before, my purpose in responding to Lal's criticisms is not to belittle his exalted position as an ācārya in the *Pusti-mārga sampradāya* or discourage his followers. As a devout follower of Vallabhācārya he did his duty by attempting to support his predecessor ācārya, but he went too far by directly criticizing Śrīla Jīva Gosvāmī with harsh words. Hence, it becomes the duty of Śrīla Jīva Gosvāmī's followers to answer Lāl so all unbiased readers can decide the outcome. The philosophy of *acintya-bhedābheda* of Lord Caitanya is the essence of *Śrīmad-Bhāgavatam*. We present a few more facts to further clarify the matter.

As mentioned earlier, Lāl's objections can be divided in two classes—those based on internal contradiction and those based on tradition. The internal contradictions have been resolved and some light was shed on the traditional acceptance. From studying the available commentaries, a chart has been prepared to show what commentators considered the disputed chapters interpolated and wrote commentary in refutation. (See Table VII)

Śrīla Jīva Gosvāmī lists the following commentaries, which are now lost, but which accepted the three chapters: *Vāsanā Bhāṣya*, *Citśukhī*, *Sambandhokti*, *Vidvat-kāmdhenu*, *Suka Manoharā*, *Paramahāṁsa Priyā* of Bopadeva, *Hanumad Bhāṣya* and so on. Comparing all these commentaries we see that most of the commentators have accepted the three chapters as authentic. Even among those who reject them, most still commented on them. Though they all say the reason for their commenting is that the pastimes in the three chapters are popular, had they shown the courage of their conviction by not commenting they would have been more convincing.

In fact there are only three commentators who did not comment on these three chapters and out of them, only one says that these three chapters are interpolated. The rest of

the ācāryas have commented on them even if they do not accept these chapters as bona fide. So from the commentaries, it is clear that most are in favor.

Śaṅkarācārya was a disciple of Govindapāda, who was a disciple of Gauḍapāda. Gauḍapāda wrote several literary works and in his commentary on *Uttara Gītā*, a book on *yoga*, he quotes from one of the disputed chapters of the *Śrīmad-Bhāgavatam* (10.14.4). This indicates that he considered these chapters authoritative. In the Śaṅkara-sampradāya, he is considered a direct disciple of Śukadeva Gosvāmī. If that has any weight then his opinion is most authoritative. Modern scholars consider he was present late in the Sixth Century. Śaṅkara himself accepted these pastimes as authentic. This is clear from his *Govindāṣṭaka*, *Prabhoda Sudhākara*, and *Sahasra-nāma Bhāṣya*. Citsukhācārya came in Śaṅkara's line and from his *Citśukhī* commentary on *Śrīmad-Bhāgavatam* it is clear that he accepted these chapters. Śrīdhara Svāmī was also initiated in the Śaṅkara-sampradāya and he considered *Citśukhī* authoritative. Thus the claim that Śrīdhara Svāmī wrote just out of custom has no basis. Rather, he followed the *paramparā* which is much older than *Pusti Mārga* as well as *dvaita-vāda*. Hence the acceptance of these chapters by the great scholar of *Śrīmad-Bhāgavatam* and follower of Śaṅkara, Bopadeva, is not inadvertant.

The *Gītā* Press, Gorakhpura, India, is well known for printing authoritative editions of *Bhagavad-gītā* and *Śrīmad-Bhāgavatam*. They make use of many manuscripts to bring out these editions. Any differences in the readings are mentioned in the footnotes. The *Gītā* Press accepts the three chapters. So is the case with editions from other publishers.

Traditionally, *Śrīmad Bhāgavatam* is recited for one week for material as well as spiritual gains. This practice comes from the *Bhāgavata Māhātmya* mentioned in the *Padma* and *Skanda Purānas*. In this one week recital a fixed number of chapters are recited each day. The number varies according to the purpose. All the standard recitation schedules include the 335 chapters. If only 332 chapters are recited, the participants do not get the desired benefit.

TABLE VII

OPINIONS OF SANSKRIT COMMENTATORS ON THE ŚRIMAD-BHĀGAVATAM REGARDING THE DISPUTED CHAPTERS

Author In chronological order	Name of Commentary	Considered Interpolated	Wrote Commentary	Wrote Refutations
1. Śrīdhara Svāmī	<i>Bhāvartha Dīpikā</i>	No	Yes	No
2. Madhvāchārya	<i>Bhāgavat Tātparya</i>	No Mention	No	No
3. Vallabhāchārya	<i>Subodhīni</i>	Yes	Yes	Yes
4. Sanātana Gosvāmī	<i>Brhad Vaiśnava Tosaṇī</i>	No	Yes	No
5. Jīva Gosvāmī	<i>Krama-Sandarbha</i>	No	Yes	No
6. Madhusūdana Sarasvatī	<i>Hari Līlāmṛta Tīkā</i>	No	Yes	No
7. Śrīnātha Cakravarṭī	<i>Caitanya Mata Mañjūṣā</i>	No	Yes	No
8. Vijaydhvaja	<i>Pāda-ratnāvalī</i>	No Mention	No	No
9. Virarāghava	<i>Bhāgavat Candrikā</i>	Yes	Yes	No
10. Śrī Nīvāsa Suri	<i>Tattva-dīpikā</i>	Yes	Yes	No
11. Sudarśana Suri	<i>Śuka Pakṣiya</i>	Yes	Yes	No
12. Satyadharma	<i>Bhāgavat Tippanī</i>	Yes	No	No
13. Viśvanātha Cakravarṭī	<i>Sārārtha-darśini</i>	No	Yes	No
14. Baladeva Vidyābhūṣana	<i>Vaiśnavānandī</i>	No	Yes	No
15. Hari Sūri	<i>Bhakti Rasāyanam</i>	No	Yes	No
16. Bhāgavat Prasadācārya	<i>Bhakta Manorañjanī</i>	No	Yes	No
17. Gopālānanda Muni	<i>Niyudhārtha Prakāśā</i>	No	Yes	No
18. Śukadeva	<i>Siddhānta Pradīpa</i>	No	Yes	No
19. Gīridhārī Lāl	<i>Bālaprabodhīni</i>	Yes	Yes	Yes
20. Varmāśidhara	<i>Bhāvartha Dīpikā Prakāśā</i>	No	Yes	No
21. Gaṅgāsahāya	<i>Anvītartha Prakāśā</i>	No	Yes	No
22. Kaśinātha Upādhyāya	<i>Tattva Prakāśā</i>	No	Yes	No

The most crucial problem which critics like Lāl have carefully avoided is the number of verses in the *Bhāgavatam*. According to the *Matsya*, *Viṣṇu*, and *Skanda Purāṇas* and the *Nārada Pancarātra*, *Śrīmad-Bhāgavatam* has 18,000 verses. No one disputes this point. Gaṅgāsahāya, the writer of *Anvitārtha Prakāśa*, counted all the words of *Śrīmad-Bhāgavatam* including the *ūvācas* and chapter endings, added them up and divided by 32 to convert the whole *Śrīmad-Bhāgavatam* into *Anuṣṭup* verses. This is the standard way to count the number of verses. He did this thrice and his calculation was short by 1½ verses. He included the three disputed chapters and the seven verses from the Chapter Six of the Tenth Canto in his calculation.

Somehow it may be possible to accommodate the shortage of one and half verses by comparing different editions, but if these three chapters and the seven verses are removed, the *Bhāgavatam* will be short by about 210 *anuṣṭup* verses and there would be no way to compensate for this loss. It means that more than one percent of the total *Bhāgavatam* would be missing.

Vallabhācārya declared the three chapters and seven verses spurious and gave some simple reason to substantiate his idea. But actually he commented on these chapters and accepted their popularity. He does not seem to seriously reject these chapters. It is his followers who have made this a big issue and wrote a great deal about it. In this respect, Giridhara himself is guilty of stepping over his founder ācārya of the *śuddha-dvaita sampradāya*.

Our conclusion is substantiated by verses from *Puruṣottama-sahasra-nāma* or *A Thousand Names of Kṛṣṇa*, which was composed by Vallabhācārya. These names are all based on Kṛṣṇa's pastimes narrated in *Śrīmad Bhāgavatam*. Vallabhācārya writes:

*pūrāṇa-puruṣah viṣṇuh puruṣottama ucyate
nāmnām sahasram vakyāmi tasya bhāgavatoddhṛtam*

"Lord Viṣṇu, the oldest person, or the person who is glorified by all the *Purāṇas* is called *Puruṣottama*. I will recite His 1000 names taken from *Śrīmad-Bhāgavatam*." (Text 1)

*ananta eva kṛṣṇasya līlā nāmapravartikā
uktā bhāgavate gūḍhāḥ prakaṭā api kutracit*

"Lord Kṛṣṇa has unlimited names because of His unlimited *līlās*. In *Śrīmad-Bhāgavatam* these are mentioned directly and sometimes indirectly." (Text 3)

atastāni pravakṣyāmi nāmāni muravalrinah

Therefore I will recite these names of Lord Kṛṣṇa, the enemy of the Mura demon, beginning from the First Canto. (Text 4)

While listing the names based on *līlās* in the Tenth Canto Vallabhācārya writes:

*aranyabhoktāpyathavā bālalīlā-prarayanaḥ
protsāhajanakaścaivam aghāsuraṇiśudanah
vyāla-mokṣa-pradah puṣṭo brahma-moha-pravardhanah
ananta-mūrtih sarvātmājanāgama-sthāvaraṇākṛtih
bramha-mohana-kartā ca stutya ātmā sadāpriyah (167-169)*

Here he clearly mentions the names based on the pastimes in Chapters Twelve, Thirteen, and Fourteen, such as killer of Aghāsura, one who eats in the forest, liberator of the snake (Aghāsura), cause of Brahmā's delusion, who has unlimited forms (shown to Brahmā), *brahma-mohana-kartā*, or he who bewilders Lord Brahmā. Further, in concluding he writes:

*haryāveśita-cittena śrībhāgavatasāgarāt
samuddhṛtāni nāmāni cintāmanī-nibhāni hi*

One whose heart is captivated by Lord Hari has extracted these names, which are like touchstone, from the ocean of *Śrīmad-Bhāgavatam*. (252)

This proves that Vallabhācārya was not convinced in his heart that the three chapters are spurious. The *dvaita-vādīs* have reason to deny these chapters because they cannot fit them in their philosophy, but we see no reason why *Puṣṭi margīya ācāryas* have let loose their wrath when these chapters have nothing contradictory to their philosophy, except

for the personal liberation of Pūtanā. Thus we suggest that the modern followers of Vallabhācārya reconsider the issue with an unbiased mind.

Finally we would like to ask the following question. Who did the interpolation and when? No critic has furnished an answer to this. Indeed no one will ever be able to furnish one. Therefore with no substantial proof we have no reason to accept their claim that the three chapters and seven verses are interpolations.

While it is convenient to brand anything incomprehensible as spurious, this is not a good idea. Especially in relation to the *Bhāgavatam*, which is giving us the essence of knowledge regarding the name, fame, qualities, and pastimes of the Supreme Personality of Godhead. There is further proof from *sādhu* and *sāstra* that the Tenth Canto has ninety chapters. A renowned 16 Century poet of Kerala, Nārāyaṇa Bhaṭṭa, composed a work called *Nārāyaṇiyam*, with 1,036 verses divided into twelve chapters. Each chapter corresponds to a canto of *Śrīmad-Bhāgavatam* in the same order, i.e., Chapter Ten summarizes the Tenth Canto. It includes the killing of Aghāsura and bewilderment of Brahmā. He has composed twenty verses describing these pastimes. This means that scholars in Kerala considered these chapters part of *Śrīmad-Bhāgavatam*.

Similarly, the eighteenth century work, *Śrī-bhakti-rasāyanam*, written by the great *Bhāgavatam* scholar Hari Sūri, explains the first forty-nine chapters of the Tenth Canto in verse. Each chapter of his book corresponds to each of the forty-nine chapters of the Tenth Canto. Therein Hari Sūri has accepted the three chapters that Lāl disputes.

Bopadeva, who is acclaimed as a great scholar of *Bhāgavatam*, wrote in his *Hari-līlāmrta, nirodho daśama-skandhe navaty adhyāya īritah*: "The Tenth Canto describes the topic *nirodha*. It has ninety chapters." Further on he writes:

vadhaśca vatsa-bakayos tathāghāsura-bhogināḥ
vatsa-cora-brahma-moho brahmanā stavaṇam hareḥ

The Tenth Canto describes the killing of Vatsāsura, Bakāsura, and the snake Aghāsura. It narrates the

stealing of calves, Brahmā's bewilderment, and glorification of Lord Kṛṣṇa by Brahmā.

To drive home the final point we cite the following verses which clearly state that *Śrīmad-Bhāgavatam* has 335 chapters:

*grantho'ṣṭādaśa-sāhasraḥ śrīmad-bhāgavatābhidhah
pañca-trimśottarādhayāyas trisati-yukta iśvari*

O Pārvati, the beautiful *Śrīmad-Bhāgavatam* has 18,000 verses in 335 chapters. (*Gauri-tantra, Bhāgavata mahātmya* 2.26).

Here Lord Śīva explicitly states that *Śrīmad-Bhāgavatam* has 335 chapters. Therefore, on the authority of the greatest Vaiṣṇava, Lord Śīva, Śrīla Jīva Gosvāmī's analysis of *dvātrīṁśat trīśatāṁ* from the invocatory verse of Śrīdhara Svāmī to mean 335 instead of 332 is correct.

*skandheṣu sarveṣu gatāṁ bruve'ham
adhyāya-sāṅkhyāṁ śrūṇuta dvijendrāḥ
ekonavīṁśā daśā rāmarāmāś
tathaika-trimsad-rasa-netra sāṅkhyāḥ
nandendusāṅkhyāḥ śāra-candra-sammitaś
caturdvayām cāgrimake tathaiva
kha-nanda-sāṅkhyā vidhu-vahni-sāṅkhyā
adhyāyasāṅkhyāḥ kramatāstrirūpāḥ
(Kauśika-Saṁhitā)*

O best of twiceborn, listen to me about the chapters in each Canto of the *Śrīmad-Bhāgavatam*. The First Canto has nineteen chapters; the Second, ten; the Third, thirty-three, the Fourth, thirty-one; the Fifth, twenty-six; the Sixth, nineteen; the Seventh, fifteen; the Eighth, twenty-four; the Ninth, twenty-four; the Tenth, ninety; the Eleventh, thirty-one; and the Twelfth, thirteen chapters.

This totals 335. Devotees of Kṛṣṇa accept *Śrīmad-Bhāgavatam* as nondifferent from Him. Any act of reducing or cutting any part of this incarnation of the Lord in book form is comparable to the act of Jarā, the hunter, whose arrow pierced Kṛṣṇa's heel. Rejecting any part of the Tenth Canto is even worse because according to the *Padma Purāṇa*, the Tenth Canto is not His heel, but the smiling face of Lord Kṛṣṇa.